

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE

**June 12, 2008
1:30 p.m., MST**

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Hearing Room 1 of the Senate Building, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. MST.

1. Call to Order

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Mr. Jim DiCello

Dr. Eugene Garcia

Ms. Margaret Dugan

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Eileen Klein

Ms. Karen Merritt

Absent:

Dr. John Baracy

Ms. Anna Rosas

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

2. Approval of April 10, 2008 and May 14, 2008 minutes of Task Force meetings

Mr. Alan Maguire asked if there were any edits to the April 10, 2008 minutes or the May 14th, 2008 minutes of the ELL Task Force meeting. There were none. Mr. Jim DiCello moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Dugan. The April 10, 2008 and the May 14, 2008 ELL Task Force meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Preliminary review of the Alternate Proposed Models received prior to April 29, 2008

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that there were three alternate proposed models ready for a preliminary review. He asked committee members to note that these same three models are listed under Agenda Item Four where possible action may occur. These proposed alternate models may receive both preliminary review and action at the same meeting to allow the Task Force to review and act upon proposed alternate models at a quicker pace because of the upcoming school year calendars. The school districts involved were notified of this.

Ms. Stacie Crain-Hacker, Director of English Acquisition Services, and Mr. Eric Gundrum, Administrator for K-12 Academic Services, spoke on behalf of the Peoria Unified School District. They had discussed their alternate proposed model with Mr. John Stollar (Associate Superintendent for Accountability in the Arizona Department of Education) and had edited it afterwards. Their model would group ELL Kindergarten students in clusters inside mainstream classrooms using differentiated instruction to obtain four hours of English Language Development (ELD). Each ELL student would have a personal plan similar to a Written Individualized Instruction Plan (WICP). The ELLs would have access to both the ELD they need as well as the normal content of the classroom. First through eighth grade ELLs who are classified as Pre-Emergent through lower Intermediate (the lower 3/4 of the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment [AZELLA] score and lower AIMS scores), would be served by a "Two Plus Two" model that has two hours of ELD (ELLs separated by proficiency) and two hours of ELD in the mainstream classroom using differentiated instruction. Higher Intermediate ELLs would be in small clusters in mainstream classrooms. All teachers implementing this model are SEI endorsed and many have English as a Second Language (ESL) or bi-lingual endorsements as well. Pre-Emergent through lower Intermediate ELLs in high school would participate in a "Three Plus One" model that has three hours of ELD (ELLs separated by proficiency) and one hour of ELD in a content-area class with mixed proficiencies. Upper-level Intermediate students would be in mainstream classrooms according to their level, from basic math and English to more advanced classes in these subjects. Upper-level Intermediate would be determined by both their AZELLA score and their scores on the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS).

Ms. Eileen Klein asked how this alternate model differs from Peoria's current practices. Ms. Crain-Hacker stated that the ELLs are currently more spread out and implementation of this model would cluster them together more and focus more on individual plans. Also, ELLs in higher grades who have lower proficiencies would obtain more ELD instruction. Ms. Klein asked about budget implications. Ms. Hacker stated this model would be about 2/3 less expensive than Peoria USD's original budget request to ADE. Currently, the SEI classrooms instruct Pre-Emergent to Basic ELLs for one hour in ELD; in the new plan, these ELLs would receive two hours. In the mainstream classrooms there is one teacher per class.

Dr. Eugene Garcia sought verification that four hours of ELD would be covered, through content or directly. Ms. Crain-Hacker concurred. Dr. Garcia asked if there were any provisions of the law not being met by this proposed alternate model. Ms. Crain-Hacker stated that the upper one-fourth of the Intermediate ELL students might not receive a full four hours of ELD if they were passing their AIMS tests. Ms. Margaret-Dugan commented that this looked mostly like mainstreaming, and asked if teachers would have ELLs of one proficiency or mixed proficiencies in their ELL clusters. Ms. Crain-Hacker stated that weren't enough ELLs in kindergarten to make a full ELL class.

Next to present were Ms. Heather Wilson, ELL Content Specialist, Phoenix Union High School District (PUHSD); Dr. Deborah Gonzales, Assistant Superintendent, PUHSD; and, Mr. Art Lebowitz, Superintendent, PUHSD. Approximately 15% of their student population is ELL.

Their district has the largest group of 10th graders in the state; one in five 10th-graders who takes the AIMS test is in Phoenix UHSD. Their district ELLs are often long-term ELL students who have been ELLs for two years or more. The district has negotiated small class sizes (16-18 students) for ELLs classified as Pre-Emergent and Emergent. The district labels ELLs a little differently than AZELLA; the Basic level on AZELLA is considered "Intermediate," and Intermediates who are approaching on AIMS are called "Advanced" and "Transitional" ELLs. They already use a four-hour ELD model for Pre-Emergent and Emergent ELL students.

Ms. Wilson stated that the ELL program for PUHSD has shown to be successful (on page three of their proposal, Attachment A), with a preliminary reclassification percent this year of 20%. Mr. Maguire stated that there appeared to be three groups of ELLs in the district: those who opt out of SEI with a parental signature, those who have not passed the AZELLA, and those who have and are still being supported in the program. Because of the mobility in the district, it is difficult to keep a close record of the average length of time necessary for an ELL student to become proficient, but the length of time appears to be about two and a half years. Ms. Dugan asked if this time period includes how long an ELL student was in the ELL program before coming to the district. Ms. Wilson stated that this does not include time spent in other ELL programs at other schools or districts.

When the state changed proficiency assessments from the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment to AZELLA, 437 students who had not passed the SELP tests passed the AZELLA and were identified as proficient. The PUHSD still supports these students under their ELL program. With the increase to four hours of ELD, the district expects to increase their ELL reclassification rate. Having found that the long-term Intermediate ELLs are the ones who seem to have the most difficulty attaining proficiency, the district will focus on these students. Part of the four hours of ELD would be in content areas such as social studies and science, with SEI-endorsed teachers who would work to become Highly Qualified as English teachers within the next year.

Ms. Dugan asked if they would be teaching language with the content as background. Ms. Wilson stated that they would be teaching the content with the idea that there is also a language objective to be met. The district has already separated the DSI objectives into what needs to be achieved each quarter, and integrated these into the curriculum. Ms. Dugan asked if they have the teachers with the correct training to teach both content area and language. Ms. Wilson stated that they already have ESL science teachers at every school, as well as various social studies teachers. As a former high school principal, Ms. Dugan commented that it can be difficult to get content-area teachers to teach language and grammar. Dr. Garcia commented that if they were able to do so, it would be a very rich learning environment.

Mr. Maguire asked for clarification for the various grades and proficiencies. Ms. Wilson stated that all 9th graders take physical science. There might be a mixing of Basic and Intermediate ELLs in the class. The other grades have other science or social studies and math as their third and fourth hours of ELD. Dr. Garcia asked if the district was outside the law in their proposal. Ms. Wilson stated that, from her perspective, this model was within the demands of the law.

Ms. Valerie Dehombreux , Principal of Cradleboard Elementary School, Whiteriver Unified School District, spoke next to describe their proposed alternate model, which is another “Three Plus One” model with three hours of ELD (ELLs separated by proficiency) and one hour of ELD in a content area in a mixed classroom. This model is especially for their 6th grade that has 23 non-ELL and 6 ELL students. Due to low numbers of ELLs in kindergarten, the Individual Language Learner Plan (ILLP) model probably will be used. The school expects its ELL reclassification rate this year to be 17%. The ELL student’s fourth ELD hour may be math, science, social studies or language varying by day but will include speaking, vocabulary, and other language skills. The school has only Basic and Intermediate ELL students currently in attendance.

Dr. Garcia asked if theirs was a logistic alternative. Ms. Dehombreux stated that it was more philosophical as it allows more content to be taught to ELLs, which would benefit them. Mr. Jim DiCello asked if this was the only elementary school in the district. Ms. Dehombreux stated there are two other elementary schools in the district, but they are not going to use an alternate model.

4. Review, discussion and possible action of Alternate Proposed Models

Mr. John Stollar addressed the Task Force, stating that today was an important day because it is important that the Task Force make decisions now which will affect the coming school year. He thanked his staff for all of their work reading, evaluating, and editing the alternate proposed models. Staff from the Office of English Acquisition Services (OELAS) in the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) made many suggestions to districts to help them conform to the law; districts could choose to use or not to use the ADE suggestions. OELAS staff members created a rubric so that alternate models could be evaluated according to the points of the law. One challenge was to tighten vague and non-specific language in many of the proposals.

Through conversations with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, it was decided that the state reclassification rate average was too low a standard for success. Staff members in OELAS set the reclassification rate at 30% as a benchmark to determine the success of an ELL program. Staff members in OELAS created a spreadsheet that compared all of the districts in the state. Mr. Stollar examined special considerations unique to a school or district to help staff members in OELAS make their recommendations to the Task Force.

Ms. Eileen Klein had questions about the general recommendations made by Mr. Stollar and staff members in OELAS regarding the alternate proposed models. She asked first what qualifications Mr. Stollar had to make a recommendation, as the law is very specific in what an ELL plan requires. She noted that he had proposed a number of things which the Task Force could approve without restrictions, approve with certain restrictions or conditions, or reject. She asked if the SBOE is at all involved and if there were a separate criterion upon which to base the recommendation. Mr. Stollar stated that there was no SBOE involvement and no separate criteria. He had originally intended to recommend programs by district, but had since decided to

make his recommendation by school, as different schools within a district may have different criteria.

Ms. Klein commented that he did not have this right by law. She asked by what right ADE has to make a recommendation on proposed alternate models which by law must be reviewed and either approved or rejected by the ELL Task Force. Mr. Stollar stated that the law did not prohibit ADE from making any recommendations to the Task Force. Ms. Klein stated that his recommendations would be one interpretation of the law, but there is no legal foundation for this recommendation. The ELL Task Force worked very diligently to meet the letter of the law in their drafting of the ELL models. She asked what legal foundation ADE used to alternate from the reading of the law for these proposed alternate models.

Mr. Stollar responded that the law states that the ELL must make models to address different populations and characteristics for small and large districts with high and low numbers of ELLs, and then the Task Force should set up a process to approve or reject other proposed alternate models. ADE set up a review process to help facilitate the Task Force review process; ADE's recommendation is only a recommendation, and the Task Force makes the final decision. The alternate models should be different than the models drafted by the ELL Task Force. This is where the statutory mandate originates. Ms. Klein asked if "alternate" allows an exemption from the statute, or allows other criteria, but still within the confines of the law. Mr. Stollar stated that alternate could mean either an alternate structure within the model, or a structure outside the ELL Task Force model.

Ms. Klein asked if Mr. Stollar was concerned that ADE's criteria for recommendations could set up two different sets of criteria that students would be held to – one, a reading of the law, and another, a looser reading of the law in the alternate models. Mr. Stollar did not believe this was the case. For him, the most important piece in an alternate model was the four hours of ELD; this was non-negotiable. Ms. Klein asked if he had a separate definition of ELD. Mr. Stollar stated that ELD meant just that, driven by the ELL Proficiency Standards. It can use content, but only with language as the objective and content as supporting structure. As a former math teacher, he does not believe that math is a content area in which English Language Development can be taught. He strongly believes that what P UHSD has designed could be a very effective ELL program. He believes that P UHSD is not trying to circumvent the law, but it is trying to comply with the letter of the law and also accomplish the needs of the students. Whether a school or district calls it a "Three Plus One" or a "Two Plus Two" model, ADE will monitor whether they are using the ELL Proficiency Standards as the primary objectives in an ELD class. If a teacher is not aware of the ELL Proficiency Standards or if there is an indication that these are not the standards of the class, then ADE would take appropriate action.

Ms. Klein asked if there is a temporal element to the recommendations. Mr. Stollar believed that OELAS can make recommendations for only one year. All approvals will be conditional for one year as they are all of experimental design. Twenty-nine schools, or less than 1% of the schools in Arizona, would be using alternate models. The first school year after implementation would be an opportunity to determine if these alternate models are effective. Mr. Stollar believes this

was the intent of the law, to allow alternate approaches and to observe what works. Ms. Klein asked if ADE is ready to monitor state schools and districts, as she had read an article arguing that the department is not ready. Mr. Stollar assured her that OELAS in ADE is ready. When asked about budget considerations, Mr. Stollar stated that the SEI budget requests for alternate models follow the same guidelines as the SEI budget requests for the Task Force's approved models. Also, he assumed that teacher qualification requirements were the same as in the ELL TF models.

Mr. DiCello stated there were 23 recommendations for schools as well as the three which held their preliminary presentations today. The recommendations were by district rather than by school. Dr. Garcia stated that while the Task Force developed their model following the law, he believed the alternate models follow a different reading, extending beyond the narrow reading of the statute. Mr. Stollar stated that there are some elements in some of the alternate models which fall a little outside the law, and this was why they required some evidence of success to obtain a recommendation. Dr. Garcia stated that model the Task Force developed does not have evidence to back its success. He expressed that it was useful that ADE had taken a reclassification percentage like 30% to prove success from an alternate model. He expressed hope that ADE will monitor the districts using the ELL Task Force models as rigorously as those using alternate models. Dr. Garcia also stated that it was not entirely fair to make recommendation for anything that falls outside the law. He believed that the rubric showed if a model followed the seven points of the law, and if they did, they should be considered for the Task Force's approval. It seemed to him, however, that at the last moment Mr. Stollar was changing the rules a little to include recommendations for models that he believed did not meet all seven criteria. Mr. Stollar stated that if he were going only with the seven criteria he would not be able to recommend any of the alternate proposed models today. He wants to help districts with alternate models that he believes may be successful.

Mr. Maguire stated that he came to the Task Force as the only member not directly in education, and that he has learned a great deal over the past couple of years through his work with the Task Force and ADE in the development of the models. He has come to have a great deal of respect for the law and believes that many of the provisions have wisdom to them, though they may not be comfortable. The model created by the Task Force followed the prescriptive nature of the law while also working with school districts in a realistic manner to better the education of ELLs and their attainment of proficiency in the English language. He recalled there were three main points that the Task Force members debated heatedly: the four hours of ELD, the definition of ELD, and the grouping of students by proficiency. There were different views on these three points. As the alternative proposals were submitted, there was discussion about how to handle these. The rubric was an attempt to take complex and sometimes vague descriptions of alternate models and to evaluate them. Another tool was the chart recommended by Ms. Klein that shows which points the various alternate models meet. The alternate models themselves were another way for schools and districts to present alternate ideas of models to the Task Force for approval. However, this in itself, clearly does not prescribe that models not adhering to the law be approved. Mr. Maguire stated that there have been several key moments in the activities of the Task Force. One was answering the question of what would be taught in four hours of ELD.

This led to the blocks of time for various components of the English language which made its way into the ELL TF models. Another such moment was in understanding that the AZELLA is a fair assessment which gauges when an ELL student is ready to move into a mainstream classroom. The alignment of AZELLA, the ELL Proficiency Standards, and the Arizona Academic Standards was the crux of the success of the ELL program. The third critical point was the problem of mobility in this population of students and how to address this problem. ELL student mobility argues for a more uniform approach across schools and districts. The chart shows that the only alternate proposed model that comes close to meeting the strict prescriptions of the law is the PUHSD. The fourth hour must be an ELD class with a specific ELL Proficiency Standard to be achieved. It should not be a science class or a social studies class. The fourth hour would probably be a reading class, but it could use a science or social studies text. Mr. Maguire stated that he believed the P UHSD model was fully compliant under the law and should be adopted.

Mr. Stollar gave an update on the Gadsden Elementary School District (GESD) alternate model. Ed Pastor Elementary School has 10 classrooms. Based upon the student numbers per classroom, if ELLs are separated from non-ELL students, the school would have to create two new classes. The GESD goal was to ensure the school adheres to the four hours of ELD. The district is still working on its proposed alternate model. San Luis Middle School (MS) had a different problem: an extremely high ELL population and very few non-ELLs. Mr. Stollar stated that in order to handle their situation, their model made sense.

Mr. Maguire asked for clarification on the GESD models. His first concern was whether San Luis MS ELL students would have four hours of ELD. Mr. Stollar agreed this was a concern. Mr. Stollar agreed that placing a few non-ELLs in a class with all ELLs in an extremely high incidence school is not really any different than placing a few ELLs with ILLPs in a non-ELL class. Mr. Maguire did not have a problem with that proposed practice. With regard to the Ed Pastor School, Mr. Maguire asked why they could not qualify for the ILLP solution. Mr. Stollar stated that in a class of about 37 students, about half are ELL and half are not. The school did not have space to create the two classrooms. The school did not meet the 20 ELL students per three-grade band. Mr. Maguire asked if there was someone from Ed Pastor to answer questions.

Ms. Belinda Boblett- ELL Coordinator, GESD, Mr. Maragarito Uranga-Principal, San Luis MS; and Ms. Gretchen Gross-Principal, Ed Pastor Elementary School, came forward to answer questions. Ms. Gross explained that the elementary school has a high incidence of ELLs and very low incidence of non-ELLs. Non-ELLs would be mixed with ELLs, most of whom are classified Intermediate, to form a second classroom. One grade has only sufficient students to form one class, which would include all levels of ELLs and non-ELLs. Ms. Margaret Dugan asked if the proficient students were once ELLs. Ms. Gross replied that they were not. Mr. Maguire then asked how San Luis MS would handle the four hours of ELD. Mr. Uranga stated there would be five levels of language proficiency. Pre-Emergent, Emergent, and Basic would be grouped in one level. Mr. Uranga stated that they would have ELL students taking science and social studies classes in which language development would be the driver and the focus would be for students

to learn English. Mr. Maguire stated then that it was essentially a “Two Plus Two” model with two hours of ELD and then two hours of language taught through a content area.

Mr. Maguire asked the Task Force if they would like to hear from each school seeking Task Force approval for a proposed alternate model, and if they would like to take action today on those proposed alternate models. Mr. Jim DiCello moved to approve the Phoenix UHSD proposed alternate model with the two provisos by Mr. Maguire and the identification of what the last hour of ELD would comprise based on the current discussion. Ms. Dugan asked what that last hour of ELD would look like. Mr. Maguire stated that fourth hour of ELD would be delivered through a grade-appropriate content area curriculum focusing on the ELL Proficiency Standards with specific language objectives. The curriculum would be submitted to ADE/OLEAS so that they would know what to monitor. It would be four hours for the first year ELLs. At the end of the 2008-2009 school year, this alternate model would achieve the status of a working model. Mr. DiCello asked to include this in the motion. Ms. Dugan seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Mr. Maguire asked for a vote from the Task Force; the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

Dr. Garcia asked what the next steps would be now. He said that didn’t think the Task Force or ADE has done a very good job of allowing schools and districts to develop alternate models. He asked to have a larger discussion over recommendations, why certain items on the rubric are not checked off, and what the real definitions of some of those items are. Dr. Garcia stated that when Sunnyside had presented their model, he had asked them specifically if their model followed the law, and they had responded that they believed that it did. They indicated they would use ELD standards in a content area classroom. Dr. Garcia charged the Task Force to have further discussions with schools about what their models mean and to move some of the “red” areas on the rubric to “green.” He disagreed with the argument of uniformity and stated that the law stressed “alternate models.”

Mr. Stollar addressed Dr. Garcia’s concerns, stating that ADE has worked diligently with schools and districts to ensure their models come as close as possible to complying with the law. He disagreed that ELD could be taught in a math class; the subject is not conducive to the language objectives. Dr. Garcia stated that some of the other models could still work with other content areas. Mr. Stollar is aware of the time limitation. If schools and districts are willing to work with ADE to comply with the law then Mr. Stollar stated that he has no problem coming to the Task Force even after the school year begins to ask for action on items. He hopes for some sort of closure soon so that during the school year ADE can focus on monitoring. Dr. Garcia stated that the law makes no time stipulations, though he understands the logistics issues. Ms. Dugan stated that through the discussions with schools and districts they have tried to allow some “wobble room” in various components of the models while still adhering to the law. Additional criteria such as the AIMS performance and reclassification permit even more flexibility in creating a successful ELL program. ADE wanted to allow schools and districts that evidenced successful programs to have the flexibility to continue those programs, and the ADE criteria sheet was one method designed to evaluate the program.

Speaking for himself, Mr. Maguire stated that he did not see another alternative model in those listed today ready for action other than the GESD model for Ed Pastor Elementary School. He believes progress has been made in some of those districts, but not sufficient progress for him to approve their models as they currently are presented. Mr. Stollar asked for guidance to help school districts make their alternate proposals more amenable to the Task Force's approval. He stated he has not heard a motion to guide him in his actions. Ms. Klein stated that she wasn't sure what he was referring to, as the Task Force has considered alternate models, has approved some and has not approved others. She stated that she expected the schools and districts in the state to have spent this school year preparing to implement the model, and that they should continue in these efforts. Mr. Stollar thanked her for her answer.

Ms. Karen Merritt asked to revisit Sunnyside Unified School District. She wanted to know how the two hours of content were different from the PUHSD model. Mr. Maguire stated it was a difficult decision for him to make. What ADE heard was that if it was a content area class that just happened to include a few English language objectives, then it was marked as red on the rubric. If the class was really focused on ELD and used content only in the pursuit of the ELL Proficiency Standards, then it was evaluated as adhering to the criteria and given a "green" mark on the rubric. Dr. Garcia asked if the judgment was made by Mr. Maguire. Mr. Maguire confirmed this.

5. Presentation and Discussion of Training Program for School District Personnel on Structured English Immersion Models

Ms. Adela Santa Cruz updated the Task Force on the training sessions. She stated that staff members of OELAS in ADE are continuing to provide training sessions in June and July. Ms. Santa Cruz said that OELAS has conducted quite a few of the Round Two training sessions for teachers, targeting four main geographic areas around and including Yuma, Phoenix, Tucson, and Flagstaff. She said that there are very few training slots still available, which means the teachers are taking the training sessions. By the end of July, the combined efforts of ADE and the trainers from partnering schools will have trained more than 4100 teachers. In addition, the ADE staff members are taking their monitoring of the training partnerships very seriously. OELAS staff members go on-site in the field and check on the training sessions offered by the partners to ensure the trainings are in compliance with ADE standards.

6. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that the Task Force will continue to work. He is concerned that alternate models approved in late June and July may be impossible to implement by the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year. He advised school districts to be mindful of this. Ms. Karen Merritt asked if there is a process other schools and districts can take if they wish to implement the Phoenix UHSD model approved today by the Task Force. Mr. Maguire stated that they would have to bring a description of what they want to do to ADE to make sure it looks the same. Ms. Merritt asked if alternate models approved by the Task Force will be available to other districts by being posted up on the ADE website. Mr. Maguire stated that amendments to

the original model should be posted on the website by now, and he would expect the newly-approved models will be posted as well.

The next ELL Task Force meeting is July 10, 2008.

7. Call to the Public

A call to the public was made at 4:00 p.m. First to speak was Ms. Maggie Benally from Window Rock USD. She was concerned about the impact the ELL model will have on Native Americans because her district wants to encourage indigenous language development as well as English proficiency. Window Rock USD wants to ensure that Native Americans retain their culture. She asks the Task Force to consider their indigenous model to help Native American students become proficient while still protecting their language and culture.

Also speaking for Window Rock USD was Ms. Loretta Tsosie. She stated that the indigenous model meets the requirements of the law. The only difference is in the grouping strategy. They have very few Pre-Emergent and Emergent students; if a student's test score is Pre-Emergent or Emergent, he or she usually has a learning disability as well. The district wishes to have proficient students as role models for ELLs and to focus on the ELLs' academic vocabulary so that they can continue on to colleges and universities. Students generally speak English and need help mostly in reading and writing. Ms. Tsosie asked the Task Force to reconsider the Window Rock USD indigenous model.

Ms. Patricia Tate, Assistant Superintendent for Osborn School District, spoke next. She asked to review the history of Osborn's proposed alternate model. They submitted the research-based alternate model on January 14, 2008 to ADE. In late February, they received 22 written questions from ADE. The district submitted a written response on February 26 to ADE, and in late March they met with Mr. John Stollar and his staff to discuss the proposed alternate model. The district submitted a revised model on March 28th to ADE to address the concerns.

The Osborn alternate model has appeared on the agenda for ELL Task Force meetings three times since their submittal to ADE. During the April 10th ELL TF meeting, the district attempted to present their proposed alternate model, but were told by the chairman that they needed to wait to present at a later meeting. They were never scheduled to present at another ELL TF meeting. Osborn SD has written e-mails to OELAS seeking further guidance regarding their alternate model. They were never given the seven point rubric nor given feedback on their revised alternate model. Recently, Superintendent Tom Horne wrote the Task Force expressing the district's frustration with the time that this process has taken and their efforts to prepare for the 2008-2009 school year. The Osborn SD believes that its model adheres completely to the law. During the training session with ADE, one day was spent writing lesson plans. These lesson plans were about how to meet content objectives along with language objectives and the use of the DSI. Ms. Tate stated that having heard today's discussion on teaching language through content, there is a disconnect between what the Task Force is saying and the training received from ADE. The ADE training she believed focused more on content. Ms. Tate expressed disappointment with the meeting, as she had hoped to learn about the areas in which the Osborn model does not comply with statute and to obtain recommendations for adjusting the model.

Next to speak was Ms. Barbara Wright from Casa Grande Elementary School District. Her question was addressed earlier by Ms. Karen Merritt. From previous discussions, it was Ms. Wright's understanding that models that have been approved by the Task Force are available for use by other schools and districts. She asked for guidance on this issue, because if her school district needs to submit a similar alternate model they need the answer soon in order to be able to work on it.

Ms. Angelina Canto from Nogales USD also addressed the Task Force. She appreciated the opportunity to present the Nogales model at the last meeting but respectfully requested the Task Force to reconsider the Nogales alternate model. Her district has spent a large amount of time and would have preferred an outright disapproval than the vague handling of the model today. She requested more information to help gain the approval of ADE and the Task Force in whatever changes were necessary to the model. She had made a written request after the May meeting for feedback on the model from ADE and the Task Force and for suggestions for any changes that were needed. The district did not receive any feedback and submitted the model again, asking for further feedback. The district called ADE on Monday to learn the status of its model and what the recommendation would be. Nogales USD was told that ADE did not know. Ms. Canto asked that the process be more transparent and requested more information and a reconsideration of their model. The district would like to continue participating as a Reading First district and requires changes to the model for that to occur.

Last to speak was Ms. Gloria Rivera from Murphy School District. The Alpha Model was listed today for consideration. Ms. Rivera wanted to point out that the Alpha Model adheres to the four hours of the ELD instruction, grouping by proficiency, but the one area in which they require guidance is kindergarten. They have shared some of their configurations with the Task Force. They have shown success with this model. They have only 10 non-ELL students and the rest are ELL students. She noted that, in the Task Force model, ELLs in high school who have high reading and oral skills may be mixed with non-ELL students for part of the time. She asks for the same consideration at the kindergarten level, so that one mixed classroom of high Intermediate ELL and non-ELL students may be created. It is not cost effective to have one class of ten non-ELL students. She asks for direction on this from the Task Force.

8. Discussion of future meeting dates

The next ELL Task Force meeting will be on July 10, 2008.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Jim DiCello moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan. The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

ELL Task Force
June 12, 2008
Page 13

Arizona ELL Task Force

Alan Maguire, Chairman